R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 998 PS 000 843

GUIDELINES FOR ELEMENTARY SOCIAL STUDIES.

BY- JAROLIMEK, JOHN

ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEV.

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC NOT AVAILABLE FROM EDRS. 41P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, *SOCIAL STUDIES, *CURRICULUM EVALUATION, *EVALUATION CRITERIA, *GUIDELINES, CURRICULUM PLANNING, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, PROGRAM CONTENT,

PRECEDED BY SUMMARIES OF THE RATIONALE AND CURRENT STATUS OF ELEMENTARY SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION, 12 GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSING EXISTING CURRICULUMS ARE PRESENTED AND DISCUSSED IN THIS BOOKLET. THE GIVEN GUIDELINES CONSTITUTE A CANON OF CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF AN INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM AND ARE CONCERNED WITH (1) THE EXISTENCE OF CLEAR AND SPECIFIC STATEMENTS OF AIMS, PURPOSES, AND OBJECTIVES, (2) THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SOUNDNESS OF THE PROGRAM, (3) THE PROVISION FOR BALANCE IN ATTENTION TO COGNITIVE, AFFECTIVE, AND SKILLS OBJECTIVES, (4) THE PROVISION FOR SEQUENTIAL AND SYSTEMATIC DEVELOPMENT OF CONCEPTS AND SKILLS, (5) THE CLEAR SPECIFICATION OF CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT, (6) THE RELEVANCE OF THE TOTAL PROGRAM, (7) THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM IS REALISTICALLY ORIENTED TO CONTEMPORARY CONDITIONS, (8) THE DEGREE OF CONSISTENCY AMONG ACTIVITIES, RESOURCES, AND STATED PURPOSES, (9) THE ADEQUACY OF PROVISION FOR DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION, (10) THE EXTENT TO WHICH COGNIZANCE IS TAKEN OF THE NEED FOR TEACHER UNDERSTANDING AND SUPPORT, (11) THE FORMULATION OF CURRICULUM DOCUMENTS WHICH ARE SIMULTANEOUSLY STRUCTURED AND FLEXIBLE, AND (12) THE PROVISION FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION IN TERMS OF STATED OBJECTIVES. PROCEDURES FOR CURRICULUM REVISION AND DEVELOPMENT ARE DISCUSSED IN THE CONCLUDING SECTION OF THE BOOKLET, AND SELECTED REFERENCES ARE APPENDED. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, NEA, 1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 FOR $1.50. (JS)

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICRO-FICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

ED019998

GUIDELINES

FOR ELEMENTARY SOCIAL STUDIES

JOHN JAROLIMEK

ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GUIDELINES

FOR ELEMENTARY SOCIAL STUDIES

Prepared for the ASCD Elementary Education Council

by

JOHN JAROLIMEK

Professor and Chairman, Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education, University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Task Force Readers

HELEN MCCRACKEN CARPENTER, Trenton State College, Trenton, New Jersey

HAROLD D. DRUMMOND, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico

AGNES M. S. INN, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii

MRS. OLIVE LEARY, Whitnall Area Schools, Hales Corners, Wisconsin

RON O. SMITH, Portland Public Schools, Portland, Oregon

HUBER M. WALSH, University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

PS 000843

Copyright © 1967 by the
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA

All rights reserved. This book or any part thereof must not be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the publisher.

Price: $1.50

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office to Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 67-31450

Preface

WHAT CONTENT is of most worth? This question has plagued teachers and all others concerned with education since the earliest instruction and is certain to remain at the heart of curriculum issues for all time. The simple answer that "the best content is that which best reaches the objectives" is too pat. Objectives are seldom stated in clear, unequivocal, behavioristic form that lends them to easy empirical test. Furthermore, the objectives themselves pose as difficult a problem. What objectives are of most worth?

In this fine booklet John Jarolimek first presents the current status and rationale for the social studies program in the elementary school. Then, recognizing that curriculum workers must choose among literally dozens of competing programs, he offers twelve guidelines as a basis for assessing the worth of an elementary social studies program. Dr. Jarolimek's expertness in this field of specialization causes him to make no claims that his criteria might be of use beyond the social studies, but the discerning reader may find that there are here good benchmarks for judging the worth of most curriculum content. No one will soon answer the question of what is worth teaching, but such standards as those set forth here will surely help in making these judgments.

November 1967

J. HARLAN SHORES
President, 1967-68
Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development

Foreword

ASSIMILATION of new proposals for the enrichment or alteration of the curriculum requires, if it is to be at all thoughtful, the employment of some set of reasoned criteria against which the necessary judgments can be made. The present document proposes such a set for use in evaluating new possibilities in elementary social studies.

The reader may be struck first of all by the fact that many of the criteria proposed by Professor Jarolimek, and affirmed by his committee of readers, are as useful in assessing innovations in other subject fields as in social studies. What this signifies is the intention of basing judgment on innovation in the social studies on the same breadth of concern that specialists in any other area would be presumed to use in their assessment of proposed changes. The criteria are, as they should be, generally useful.

Again, the reader will look in vain for evaluation of specific programs. The limitation in space may be partly responsible for this omission. But more largely the omission is one of conscious exclusion. What is attempted here is not the putting down of the overpublicized among present proposals nor the puffing of the underrated. The emphasis is on equipping the reader with guidelines that will enable him to distinguish among the present projects in the field and to discriminate as well among those that will come along in the future.

The booklet is a product of one of several task forces set up under the ASCD Council on Elementary Education to perform this kind of service. It is the first to be issued and as such sets a high level of competence for its successors. The Council members wish to express gratitude to Professor Jarolimek and his assisting panel.

ALEXANDER FRAZIER
Chairman
ASCD Council on Elementary Education

Contents

Preface

Foreword

Acknowledgments

1 Introduction

3 Current Status of Elementary Social Studies

6 Rationale for Social Studies Education

10 Guidelines for Assessing an Elementary Social Studies Program

11 **1** Are the major purposes of the program clearly stated in terms of pupil behavior, realistically attainable, and consistent with the philosophy of a democratic society?

13 **2** Is the program psychologically sound?

15 **3** Does the program show evidence of providing for balance in its attention to cognitive, affective, and skills objectives?

16 **4** Does the program provide for sequential and systematic development of concepts and skills that are believed to be important?

17 **5** Are the criteria for the selection of substantive content clearly specified in the program?

19 **6** Is the program of instruction relevant to the lives of the pupils?

20 **7** Is the scope of the program realistic in terms of the contemporary world and the backgrounds of today's pupils?

22 **8** Are the learning activities and instructional resources consistent with the stated purposes of the program?

23 **9** Does the program provide adequately for differentiated instruction?

25 **10** Is the program one that teachers will understand and be able to implement and support?

26 **11** Are the curriculum documents sufficiently structured to provide the teacher with direction, yet flexible enough to allow individual teacher initiative and creativity?

27 **12** Is it possible to evaluate the program in order to establish with some degree of confidence the extent to which major purposes have been achieved?

28 Curriculum Development

33 Selected References

Acknowledgments

FINAL EDITING of the manuscript and production of this booklet were the responsibility of Robert R. Leeper, Associate Secretary and Editor, ASCD Publications. Technical production was handled by Nancy Mullikin, Editorial Coordinator, Publications Division, NEA.

Introduction

One of the well-established principles in American education is that major decisions regarding the curriculum should be made at the local level. There are certain limitations to this principle, but there is little evidence to suggest that either the American public or the educational enterprise is of a mind to reject it. Local educational leadership today, as in the past, continues to be largely responsible for setting policy for its schools and for designing, approving, and implementing a curriculum for those schools.

Curriculum decisions at the local level, however, have always been influenced to some extent by forces external to the local community. State departments of education, state legislatures, national commissions and committees, and nationally marketed textbooks and standardized examinations have been a few of the outside forces affecting curriculum decisions at the local level.

In recent years, and particularly since 1955, other more influential forces have been added to the traditional external pressures—the federal government, educational foundations, giant publishing and media firms, professional groups and associations, and educational reformers. As a result the curriculum decision-maker at the local level may find himself relying ever more completely on the judgment and authority of those who are unfamiliar with the idiosyncrasies of the local situation.

The present educational climate is one in which curriculum reform and revision are highly valued. One could say that curriculum revision

is a way of life in schools today.[1] Most would agree that it is high time that school programs get in tune with changes taking place in the world outside the school. For too long school authorities have relied on the heavy hand of tradition in making decisions concerning curriculum and instructional practices. Yet with the current call for change have come problems, too. Whether or not a new practice is better than the one it replaces is not always carefully considered. There is a tendency to regard new and different practices as being qualitatively superior simply because they are new and different.

The curriculum leader at the local level, therefore, must consider all the dimensions of a proposed curriculum change. He will be more consistent in his decisions if he makes them within a framework of sound curriculum theory. There can be no hope that major curriculum decisions can be made wisely at the local level unless local educational leadership is well grounded in those elements that go into curriculum decision making and has some familiarity with the ends and means of designing and implementing soundly based programs of instruction. To do less means that local leaders are apt to lose their leadership roles by default. If they do not feel themselves fully qualified, they must seek such help as they can. This document is one attempt to provide guidelines for the revision, reform, or reconstruction of the elementary social studies curriculum. It is hoped that it will be of assistance to local leaders.

[1] John I. Goodlad, Renata Von Stoephasius, and M. Francis Klein. *The Changing School Curriculum.* New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1966.

Current Status of Elementary Social Studies

CURRENT EFFORTS TO REVISE THE CURRICULUM represent honest attempts to elevate the quality of education throughout the land. For a variety of reasons, education has taken on added importance in recent years—accelerated technological growth, sociological shifts in American society, increased knowledge, philosophical commitments encouraging individual self-fulfillment, and international tensions and conflicts, to name only a few. Because social studies education deals fundamentally with building social and civic literacy and competence, its importance becomes especially critical in times of instability, conflict, and domestic and international unrest. The social studies help pupils develop an understanding of themselves and their fellow human beings. Nothing is important if man destroys himself. The events of recent years provide vivid and adequate testimony that unless man learns the lessons of human relationships, there is likely to be no world at all. Moreover, the evidence is clear that the attitudes and values on which one's social and political orientation are built take shape fairly early in life.[2] Theoretically, therefore, the social studies program occupies a position of great importance in the modern elementary school curriculum.

Does one observe this degree of importance attached to elementary social studies in schools today? Hardly so. The primary grades have become all-consumed with a skills-teaching operation. In many primary-

[2] David Easton and Jack Dennis. "Political Socialization of the Elementary School Child." *Political Science in the Social Studies.* Thirty-sixth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, a department of the National Education Association, 1966. pp. 216-35.

grade classrooms the social studies, if taught at all, are a part of the reading program. In other classrooms, units formerly dealing with social studies content and concepts have become science units. Likewise, in the middle grades the curriculum has tended to stress mathematics, science, and foreign languages at the expense of social studies.

Social studies instruction in the middle and upper grades often has lacked appeal to the pupils and teachers alike because it is formal and largely descriptive, thereby providing pupils with little opportunity to gain insights into the group and individual behavior of that delicate mechanism called a human being. There are exceptions to this general picture, of course, but one can hardly deny the relatively low status of the social studies in many elementary curriculums. Social studies education cannot and will not be very effective in American elementary schools until it is given and truly earns the high priority importance in the curriculum that it deserves.

Efforts to make the social studies more relevant and meaningful to pupils have a long history. Perhaps no area of the school curriculum was as thoroughly affected by the child development movement and the progressive education movement of the first half of this century.[3] These efforts, whatever their shortcomings, explored and developed ways of working with pupils in elementary social studies that have their counterparts in the better programs today. A case in point is the concern for problem solving that was central to good programs of the past generation. Problem solving is still important, although in present-day programs it is usually labeled "inquiry," "induction," or "discovery." Methods of working with children in order to make social studies exciting, interesting, and vital have been developed through the years, and they need to be more widely understood and applied in the schools of today.

The reform movements of the 1930s and 1940s were concerned with the child and the methodology of elementary social studies; the current thrust is based on concern for the substantive content of the curriculum. Few today are speaking and writing about the social role of social studies, and this is unfortunate. The concern presently expressed in the literature is for the development of concepts from the various disciplines contributing to the social studies. Social studies education in the contemporary setting seems not often to be perceived as having any particular responsibility for the humanizing of the individual child. This area is, rather, concerning itself with familiarizing pupils with the

[3] Lawrence Cremin. *The Transformation of the School.* New York: Harper & Row, Inc., 1961.

basic concepts of the social sciences and with the intellectual skills needed to deal with social phenomena in a rational, thoughtful manner.

Familiarizing pupils with concepts and intellectual skills is, of course, a part of the socializing, humanizing process. The concepts and skills help the pupil see himself as an individual in the human society; and as he interacts with his classmates and his teacher in the process of study, he is being socialized. Nevertheless, the present emphasis in social studies education is such that it becomes easy to disassociate the substantive elements of the program from actual pupil behavior. To the extent that this happens, programs will lack meaning and relevance for pupils and will fall short in meeting their responsibility to pupils and to the larger society.

Since 1960, social studies revision has proceeded at an accelerated pace. Stimulated by the climate of reform, along with the heavy investment of funds by the federal government and other sources, numerous social studies curriculum projects have been initiated. Many of the projects have the term "experimental" associated with them, but the curriculum worker should not be misled by the use of this expression. Experimentation suggests something in the way of a scientific approach to the development of new programs, thus giving them the authority and status of scientific research studies.

In most cases current curriculum development in the social studies could by no stretch of the imagination properly be called experimentation. In an experiment there are dependent and independent variables, a sample is carefully selected in accordance with the canons of sampling procedure, there are controls, contaminating variables are either eliminated or controlled, and the experiment can be replicated. These conditions rarely obtain in current curriculum projects.

What passes for experimentation in most cases is simply a field trial that usually is reported as having "worked" or is revised in ways to make it work. Often such tryouts are conducted under conditions that make them impossible to replicate. Consequently, what may have "worked" for one group of teachers in a school district may or may not work for another group in the same district or in completely different settings.

This is not to suggest that current curriculum development projects are without value. Far from it. Yet they should be regarded for what they are—the trying out of ideas, many of which will be found useful in the schools in which they are tried. Projects of this type have much merit, particularly when they are carefully evaluated, because they let participating teachers directly confront genuine curriculum problems at the local level. Such projects usually result in improved teaching and learning and therefore should be encouraged.

Rationale for Social Studies Education

ELEMENTARY SOCIAL STUDIES OF THE 1960s present the observer with an odd and somewhat confused picture of new concerns, emphases, and practices wedded to a methodology based on a philosophical and psychological orientation of another time. For example, most forward-looking social studies programs are emphasizing the development of basic concepts from the disciplines. Presumably these concepts are known or at least identified in advance of the study, and instruction is directed toward their attainment. At the same time, most programs value pupil involvement in goal setting and in the selection of activities. Or, to state the conflict another way, new programs tend not to stress personal-social goals as a major concern of social studies instruction, yet schools do value activities in which pupils plan and work together on projects such as dramatizations, construction, group research and reporting, and so on.

Quite commonly, schools profess a desire to have informal social studies programs that call for heavy pupil involvement and participation, yet at the same time they make it known to teachers that specific elements of content are expected to be taught or at least "covered." Such conflicts cannot help but be confusing to teachers and parents.

Curriculum revision in the social studies often proceeds as if the major aims and purposes of the program were agreed upon. Observation of teaching practices would seem to suggest that aims and purposes often are *not* understood by or even known to teachers. How teachers can be expected to function in ways consistent with the basic orientation and intent of the program if they are unfamiliar with its rationale and major purposes is not altogether clear.

The most essential component of any social studies program is the statement of a well-thought-through rationale for social studies education. Moreover, such a statement needs to be understood by all those responsible for implementing the program. Such a rationale articulates the basic purposes of the program, what it hopes to achieve, how it will affect the lives of the pupils, and how it will demonstrate its effectiveness. The rationale is more than a statement of philosophy or point of view expressing pious hopes for the program and couched in generalities and platitudes. Such a rationale is, rather, a functional and meaningful curriculum design that accounts for all the essential components in a way that makes sense to teachers. When the rationale underlying the program is well stated and understood, expectations for teacher behavior and pupil behavior in the program become relatively easy to identify. The rationale provides a frame of reference within which other decisions will be made.

Current thinking concerning the basic purposes of social studies education is spread along a continuum, with sharp philosophical differences separating the two extremes. One position views the social studies as basically the study of the social sciences, as separate disciplines, that aims to familiarize the pupil with the basic concepts of the disciplines and with the methods of inquiry and modes of thought of the scholars in those disciplines. This position in the extreme rejects the notion that social studies education has any more unique responsibility for citizenship education than, say, mathematics or science.[4]

A more moderate position would call for the study of the social sciences as the best preparation for responsible citizenship. Proponents of this point of view often are not enthusiastic about the term "social studies" and would prefer the use of the subject labels, i.e., history, geography, economics, and so forth. Some would view the role of the pupil as a miniature social scientist, pursuing his studies in a manner akin to that of the scholar in the discipline.

At the opposite end of the continuum is the position that associates social studies education with the behavior of citizens. It holds that while the total school program contributes to education for citizenship, the social studies have a particular responsibility in this regard. Proponents

[4] Bernard Berelson. "Introduction." *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1962. pp. 6-8; Shirley H. Engle. "Objectives of the Social Studies." *New Challenges in the Social Studies.* Byron G. Massialas and Frederick R. Smith, editors. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1965. pp. 1-19; Michael Scriven. "The Structure of the Social Studies." *The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum.* Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1964. pp. 101-102; Charles R. Keller. "Needed: Revolution in the Social Studies." *Saturday Review,* September 16, 1961. p. 60.

of this view do not reject the social sciences as the parent disciplines of the social studies but view the study and knowledge of those disciplines as a means of building social and civic literacy. They would not claim that the social studies have a responsibility to make "good citizens" out of all who come to school, but they do suggest, and strongly so, that the social studies program should have some impact on the behavior of the citizen as he addresses himself to civic, social, and political affairs. Through the social studies the pupil develops perspectives, insights, understandings, values, and skills deemed to be essential to the conduct of affairs in a democratic society.

Persons supporting this position are less concerned with maintaining the disciplines as separate subjects; indeed, they often support an interdisciplinary study of a topic. They argue that the primary purpose of social studies is not to study the subject *per se*, but to use the subject as a means to an end. For example, the purpose is not to study political science because such study has intrinsic value. Rather, political science is studied because for the learner that discipline has important messages concerning the operation of government and political affairs.

This paper takes the position that the latter point of view more nearly describes the appropriate posture of the elementary school with respect to the basic purpose of the social studies. While there is merit in pursuing studies the way the scholars do—and pupils should have such experiences from time to time—most pupils are not likely to be scholars in the social sciences. However, this does not mean that they cannot approach the study of social phenomena in thoughtful ways.

Pupils, therefore, need to attack the study of social and civic affairs not so much from the point of view of the scholar as from that of the informed, thinking citizen. In social studies they should have experiences to help them learn those basic concepts and those methods of thought that lead to a rational and reflective consideration of human problems. To date there is little evidence that conventional programs have been especially effective in enhancing pupils' analysis of social problems. Clearly, improvement is needed in this area.

It seems clear, also, that social studies are a part of the school curriculum precisely because society believes these studies *do* have something to do with the conduct of citizenship. This is reflected, for example, in state laws requiring the teaching of history, geography, and the nature and structure of government. Neither the state legislatures nor the public at large are likely to accept or endorse social studies programs that disclaim responsibility for goals relating to citizenship.

Citizenship goals are easily misunderstood and are sometimes misrepresented. To be concerned with citizenship goals does not mean that

pupils are taught to be "good citizens" in dogmatic ways or that they are expected to learn the conclusions summarized in their textbooks or that the programs are concerned only with personal-social living and lack substantive content or that pupils are taught only to think happy thoughts about how they should be good to everyone else. Such approaches not only are plainly ludicrous but are patently unsound. Responsible educators do not interpret citizenship goals in this way.

Social studies programs that hope to have some impact on individual behavior are concerned first and foremost with the development of the pupil's thinking abilities. To think, one must be informed or have something substantive to think about. Consequently, social studies programs provide a strong base of substantive content, appropriately selected and tailored to the backgrounds and capabilities of individual learners. This represents the role of knowledge—drawn from the social sciences—in the social studies curriculum. To learn how to process information and to deal with it intelligently, as well as to ensure continued learning on the part of pupils, the program also equips the learner with certain essential skills. Finally, to ensure that knowledge and skills are applied to constructive rather than destructive ends and to familiarize the pupil with the role expectations society has for him as a citizen, the social studies are concerned with values and the valuing process. This concept of citizenship goals for elementary social studies places knowledge, skills, and values in proper perspective and establishes a firm link between the social studies curriculum and the learner's perception of and behavior toward social and civic affairs outside of school.

Guidelines for Assessing an Elementary Social Studies Program

THE SOCIAL STUDIES AREA is without a doubt the most difficult component of the school curriculum in which to build a meaningful and relevant program. It involves subtle types of learnings about which a great deal more needs to be known. Our knowledge of the nature and conditions under which certain learnings can be optimally achieved is limited. Much in social studies education calls for judgment and for decision making, and as a result the study of topics and problems must take into account certain value assumptions. The area of social studies is overwhelming and includes content and skills from eight or more of the social sciences, each of which is vast and complex in itself. To suggest, therefore, that curriculum building in social studies is anything but an exceedingly complex set of operations is to oversimplify and misrepresent what is actually involved.

Yet because the task is difficult and our knowledge of the learning processes is limited does not mean that we know nothing at all about what constitutes a good social studies program. The complexity of the task is sometimes used to justify unsound decisions and actions. The curriculum builder may take the point of view that since there is not complete agreement on issues relating to social studies education, one program or one way of doing things is about as good as another. Little wonder, therefore, that we see classroom and curriculum practices being promoted that should be identified as faulty by those who have any knowledge of the field and of young children. For example, if one visits

an elementary school social studies class and finds no evidence that the teacher is taking into account the wide differences in reading ability found among pupils, he can conclude that the program is weak. No amount of rationalization can explain away such an obvious deficiency. The time is long past when we should attempt to justify such a procedure.

Twelve guidelines for a soundly based program of elementary social studies education are presented and discussed in the following section. These guidelines, which take into account the complexities discussed here and focus on essential fundamental principles, can be used in assessing present social studies curriculums and also can be applied in making decisions concerning the adoption of new programs and practices.

1. Are the major purposes of the program clearly stated in terms of pupil behavior, realistically attainable, and consistent with the philosophy of a democratic society?

Aims, objectives, and purposes of social studies education are often stated in such broad, general, and abstract ways that they cannot be translated into operational guides for teaching and learning. Speculate on what would have been the progress of our space program if its objectives had been defined in ways that usually characterize the definition of objectives in the social studies. In the building of a space vehicle, a major task is the definition of objectives, sub-objectives, sub-sub-objectives—down to the most minute operation essential to the project. This represents a complete and detailed analysis of what needs to be done, what tasks are required to achieve each objective, what materials will be needed, when each objective is to be met, and so on. Without the application of these elementary concepts of systems engineering, the projects could not possibly be completed successfully within the time limits set. Compared with the objectives-setting procedure used in engineering and industry, that used in social studies seems incredibly crude and primitive.

Because social studies curriculums exist for no other purpose than to help pupils learn something they do not already know, the basic question regarding objectives is, What is it we want pupils to learn? One way or another, the curriculum builder in social studies must come to grips with this problem. He can settle for general statements of purpose such as "to help pupils understand our form of government and the laws and freedoms under which we live." Without further definition or clarification, it is assumed that (a) teachers are able to translate such a statement into operational definitions; (b) it is possible to relate such a statement to specific content and opportunities for experiences at the various grade

levels; (c) instructional attention will be given the objective at appropriate points in the curriculum; and (d) the learnings and experiences will arrange themselves sequentially to expedite their attainment by the pupils. These assumptions rarely obtain in practice; therefore, the objective becomes a statement of intent rather than a realistically attainable objective.

For the above objective to be functional, it must be further clarified and defined in terms of both content and pupil behavior. Such an objective means something quite different when applied to second graders than it does when applied to sixth graders. What does it mean to say that a 10-year-old is beginning to "understand our form of government"? What does he know? How is that knowledge reflected in what he does? The emphasis on behavior is an important one because of the tendency to presume a straight-line, linear relationship between knowing something and acting on the basis of that knowledge. Although one can assume that a knowledgeable and informed individual probably will behave more intelligently than an uninformed one, there are many exceptions to and variations of this principle.

For example, a pupil may have at his command a vast amount of descriptive information about the organization and structure of government, yet be deficient in his ability to analyze simple political issues. The behavior dimension of objectives becomes something of a "so what?" question. The pupil has the information, has the knowledge, has the skill. What does he do with it? How does he use and apply it? Unless social studies objectives are centrally concerned with pupil behavior, the subject matter selected is likely to become irrelevant and lack purpose from the pupil's point of view.

It is unlikely that social studies programs will improve substantially until much greater attention is given to the learning expectations of pupils. Allowing for individual pupil variations in performance, the question is: What should pupils know or be able to do at the time they leave the program? Having answered that question, the curriculum builder can now work backward through the grades, setting related appropriate and attainable objectives at each level. Content and opportunities for experiences are then selected to make the achievement of sub-objectives possible. This means that throughout the program, objectives for units of study will be much more specific than they are in most programs today.

Teachers and curriculum workers often are not enthusiastic about the discussion of aims, objectives, and purposes of programs. Perhaps this is because aims, objectives, and purposes as usually stated provide little or no help to the teacher in planning and teaching. If the objectives of the social studies program are not clear, the teacher may resort

to the textbook as his curriculum guide, in which case the objective becomes to teach pupils whatever is included in the text. The hard facts are that we can neither plan a program nor evaluate it unless we know what it is pupils are supposed and expected to learn.

2. Is the program psychologically sound?

Questions relating to the psychological soundness of social studies education—the great concern of educational reformers of the first three decades of this century—have again become important in present-day programs. The problem takes many forms, some of which will be discussed here, but basically it can be stated this way: Do the practices and procedures required by the program enhance or inhibit the self-fulfillment of individual pupils? This principle may be explained by citing an example.

Elementary programs in social studies include heavier loadings of content from the social sciences than they once did, on the basis that the individual today needs to know more to lead a productive life. His increased knowledge aids him in solving problems and in dealing with the world in which he lives. Knowing more gives him both confidence and a feeling of competence. It stirs a curiosity within him to learn even more. Increased knowledge in this case enhances the self-fulfillment of the pupil. Yet suppose the pupil finds his encounter with the concepts and skills too difficult to comprehend. The experience becomes one of frustration for him. He grows to dislike not only social studies but his teacher and perhaps school as well. Such school experiences will be detrimental to this child and if continued will cause him serious psychological or even physiological damage. A commonly expressed need in social studies education is that of "beefing up" the content of the programs. The "beefing up" is associated with quality, and in the process the undesirable psychological side-effects to pupils may be overlooked or not even considered.

The now famous statement by Professor Bruner that "any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development"[5] is often cited as a justification for projecting difficult concepts into lower and lower grade levels. This basically sound principle, one that had been known and applied in curriculum long before the Bruner articulation of it, has not always been wisely applied

[5] Jerome S. Bruner. *The Process of Education.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962. p. 33.

in the development of programs. For example, simply because something *can* be done by children at a particular age does not mean that it *should* be done then—or possibly even at all. Dr. Bruner himself has pointed out that one does not jump off the top of a high building simply because he is able to do so.[6]

Social studies programs that represent a strong downward extension of complex concepts need to be carefully examined for their effects on pupils and on teaching procedures. This practice has often resulted in teaching methods that are psychologically unsound in that they are formal, are confusing to pupils, and encourage verbalism rather than any degree or depth of understanding. The point must be clearly emphasized here that most programs could be improved by helping pupils learn *more* rather than less than they presently do, but that in so doing some serious consideration should be given to the total picture of the developing child.

Another facet of psychological soundness has to do with instructional materials. While most reputable publishers have made an honest attempt to produce instructional materials that reflect current developments in the social studies, a vast amount of material not only has been psychologically unsound but, in some cases, inaccurate. In the present excitement over revision and reform, teachers and curriculum workers need to scrutinize more carefully than ever the types of learning resources presented by publishers. This is especially true because of the increase in federal funding and the temptation to buy anything and everything simply because it is available. Teachers and curriculum workers need to restore confidence in their ability to evaluate instructional resources.

Similarly, psychological soundness may be detected in the types of pupil activities suggested by the program. In recent years there has been a tendency not only to project the content downward in the grades but to use teaching procedures characteristic of instruction at upper-grade levels. This led one highly capable social studies supervisor to observe that "we have taken several giant steps backwards in teaching the social studies in recent years." The trend is to rely increasingly on verbal, formal, and academically oriented approaches rather than those that involve pupils in a variety of interesting and meaningful learning experiences. This is not to suggest that the methodologies of the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s are necessarily the most appropriate for today's social studies and for today's pupils. It is, rather, to suggest that whatever methods are used should not do violence to widely accepted principles relating to the ways children learn.

[6] In a seminar at the University of Washington, Seattle, January 1967.

3. Does the program show evidence of providing for balance in its attention to cognitive, affective, and skills objectives?

The tendency to emphasize certain types of objectives at the expense of others is fairly common, and the social studies provide no exception to this educational practice. As suggested earlier, the cognitive components are the ones getting the most attention in program development today. With the increasing stress on the social sciences as sources of social studies content, there is an attempt to identify structures that serve as organizing principles for the discipline. This has led to the search for basic concepts and generalizations from the disciplines with the thought of using these as organizing frameworks for the social studies curriculum. Cognitive elements are important, of course, for without them one has no program at all. On the other hand, social studies education is concerned not just with one but with three types of objectives. All three are important and all deserve careful attention in planning and teaching.

In planning and teaching the social studies somewhat different intellectual operations are involved in learning cognitive, affective, and skills objectives. Therefore, different teaching strategies are employed in achieving and evaluating these objectives. The kind of practice and reinforcement experiences vital to the development of skills are not appropriate to the development of affective and cognitive learnings. Breadth of experience in concept development is not needed in skill development. The program of instruction must take these differences into account, even though in many social studies activities the pupil is achieving objectives in all three categories at the same time.

For example, a child preparing a report on the people of Japan will, in doing his research, build his background of informational learnings—ideas, facts, concepts, cognitive elements. He will practice his skills of information getting, information processing, writing and reporting—skills learnings. He may also encounter ideas in the process that directly affect his feelings about the people of Japan. This illustrates the kind of balance that should characterize the entire social studies curriculum. This is not to say, however, that there is not a time and a place for the focus of instruction on a single objective, such as the development of a concept or the teaching of a skill, to ensure its getting proper and systematic treatment. Balance should be reflected in the *total* program, not necessarily in the instruction of a single day or two.

The dimension of the social studies program that has received the least attention has been the affective component. Perhaps this is true because so little is known about value and attitude formation and because this is the part of the curriculum most sensitive and most subject to

controversy. Cognitive and skills objectives are relatively easy to identify and to teach, whereas values, attitudes, ideals, and feelings are nebulous, elusive, and subjective. There can be little doubt that the next thrust in social studies education is likely to emphasize the values and valuing realm, and programs under development now should take this into account.

4. Does the program provide for sequential and systematic development of concepts and skills that are believed to be important?

One of the principles reinforced time and again in curriculum projects of the past decade has been the vital importance of sequence in learning concepts and skills. Sequence may not be important in achieving certain types of affective objectives; it may not be important in all cognitive learning. Yet in concept attainment and skill development, where it can be established that there is an increasing order of magnitude in complexity and where a functional relationship exists between elements on this continuum of complexity, sequence is essential to effective teaching and learning.

Traditional approaches to the establishment of sequences in social studies have concerned themselves with the ordering of topics or with areas of study. Such sequences have dealt largely with space and time variables, moving from the here and now to the far away and long ago. The rigid adherence to an expanding environment sequence has been heavily criticized in recent years, not only because it is inconsistent with the experience backgrounds of today's pupils but also because it is not a satisfactory way of establishing sequence in learning. In fact, one could argue that the order in which topics are presented has little to do with the sequential development of concepts and skills. That is to say, it would be difficult if not impossible to demonstrate that it is better to teach about the United States in grade five and Latin America in grade six than to reverse the procedure. There is no valid reason why this arrangement would not work just as well and, in some cases, might work better than the traditional order. Some districts have attempted to build tight, logical sequences based on the ordering of topics. It is hard to evaluate such sequences on anything other than a criterion of common sense, because most topics *per se* cannot be differentiated on the basis of complexity. Whether they are easy or difficult depends on the com-

plexity of concepts included in them and the method of instruction used by the teacher.

In programming concepts and skills in learning sequences, two considerations are essential. First, the concept or skill must be operationally defined and described at several levels of complexity. In the case of skills this usually means the definition of simple related sub-skills. For example, learning cardinal directions in the primary grades is a sub-skill related to the more complex skill of orienting a map and noting directions. The second essential consideration in sequencing concepts and skills is the need for a diagnostic teaching approach by individual teachers. Responsibility for getting pupils into the sequence at the most appropriate place for them as individual learners has to be that of the classroom teacher.

Pupil variations are of such magnitude and the overlap of achievement from one grade to another is so extensive that the teacher can expect pupils within a grade or class to differ widely in their attainment of concepts and in their skill proficiency. For this reason, it is unwise to establish a firm and rigid sequence tied to specific grades. The grade in which a child is situated has almost nothing to do with what he knows. Certainly, knowledge of grade placement of pupils is not a reliable index for making decisions concerning learning needs of individuals. Of course, if there is to be any semblance of an organized social studies program, it will be necessary to designate areas of study, topics, subjects, units, or themes for the various grades. However, such organizational and curriculum structures should not be confused with learning sequences for individual pupils. Learning sequences can only be assured when teachers make careful diagnoses of the learning status of individual pupils regardless of grade level and can plan instruction in accordance with such status appraisals.

5. Are the criteria for the selection of substantive content clearly specified in the program?

One of the most difficult problems confronting the teacher and curriculum worker in the social studies is the selection of content for the program. This problem has a long history, and through the years several criteria for content selection have been suggested. Content selection deals with such questions as, What should pupils learn? For what purpose should they learn it? How can priorities be established in choosing subject matter? There must be a clear rationale for the inclusion of some

topics and subjects and the exclusion of others. The basis for making these decisions needs to be explained in the curriculum documents.

Because modern programs are stressing the development of social science concepts and generalizations, an important consideration in content choice is to select subject matter that is particularly representative and illustrative of the ideas to be taught. If, for example, the idea to be investigated is that "man is a highly adaptable creature, capable of using a variety of environments to meet his needs," one would select subject matter that illustrates this idea particularly well. In this example, perhaps case studies from a variety of environments could be used. Or, if pupils were expected to learn of the economic and political problems of the newly developing nations of Africa, a representative nation could be selected for intensive study. Surely pupils do not have to study *all* of the new nations of Africa to understand the problems of each. In such a representative study, similarities and distinctive differences in problems among these countries should be included to help pupils transfer these learnings to a broader context.

Because concepts and generalizations are selected from several of the social sciences, the subject matter will likewise be drawn from several of the social sciences. This leads to the question of whether elementary social studies units should focus on a single discipline or be multidisciplinary. The Task Force believes that effective elementary social studies programs will be either interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary[7]—in the sense that they include concepts from more than one discipline—no matter what label is attached to the program or to the unit.

It is hard to believe that a fifth-grade "history" unit on colonial living could be meaningful without the inclusion of geographic, economic, and political concepts. Similarly, "geography" units that ignore cultural, sociological, economic, and political concepts could hardly deal with geography in anything but a descriptive way. This matter should be resolved by considering the objectives to be achieved. The organizational format best suited to achieve the objectives should be the one selected. In this way some units in the program could be designed to focus more sharply on one particular discipline while other units would be multidisciplinary. In either case the concepts and other learnings need to be carefully identified to ensure their getting appropriate instructional attention.

[7] In this paper the term "multidisciplinary" means the inclusion of content and concepts from more than one discipline, while at the same time maintaining the identity and integrity of each discipline so included. The term "interdisciplinary" refers to arrangements that include content and concepts from more than one discipline in a single study without regard to their identity with any particular discipline.

Subject matter selection can be made on the basis of its suitability for use in teaching or promoting certain styles of thinking or methods of inquiry. If the program is encouraging investigation-oriented approaches to learning, the subject matter cannot be entirely descriptive. Suppose a middle-grade teacher decided to teach pupils how to use map and statistical data to discover changes in land use or settlement patterns over a period of years. He would select subject matter that lends itself especially well to this treatment. Or, if a teacher wanted pupils to learn the methods man has used in discovering information about the past, he would select a topic uniquely appropriate to such an objective. With the increasing importance of skills associated with thinking as a major outcome of social studies instruction, greater attention will need to be given to the selection of subject matter to achieve such goals.

In selecting subject matter, legislative requirements must be recognized. The study of the home state is usually mandated, as are certain topics relating to the nation's history. Legislative requirements may not always be the soundest criteria for selecting subject matter, but they are a part of the reality of the situation within which curriculums must be planned. In cases where such requirements inhibit or compromise the development of sound social studies curriculum planning, professional groups should take the lead in having the requirements changed.

Finally, a body of informational content is needed for ordinary social and civic competence. Everyone who is educated has some awareness of the world in which he lives, has some understanding of his heritage, and is familiar with basic political processes. Exactly what should be included among these learnings has never been clearly defined. Decisions on the selection of such subject matter must be made on a common sense basis, combining such criteria as usefulness, universality, and social significance.

6. Is the program of instruction relevant to the lives of the pupils?

Relevance may be used as a criterion for the selection of subject matter; but in this case it is being applied to the total program, not just to the content. Stated another way, one could ask, Do the learning activities, the resources, the subject matter, and the skills make sense to the pupils and do they regard them as vital? Or, to put it still another way, one could ask, What difference is there in the end-product (i.e., the pupil) as a result of having social studies instruction for a period of

several years? Of all the criticisms of a social studies program, perhaps none is more devastating than to say it is irrelevant.

The curriculum worker and teacher might profitably reflect on what the long-term effect on pupils would be if the social studies were not included in the curriculum at all during the first six grades. Evidently pupils do increase their informational backgrounds and do learn certain skills in the social studies. This gain is apparent by improved scores on standardized examinations as pupils move through the grades. Whether or not they actually can use the information gained in a meaningful way is open to considerable question. Also, the extent to which scores on standardized tests reflect the social studies program and the extent to which they are a reflection of general literacy, wide reading, and out-of-school learnings cannot be reliably estimated.

Relevance and meaningfulness are powerful forces in motivating a learner. Curiosity is an apparent human quality, perhaps a reflection of man's need to find meaning in the universe.[8] Discovery and inquiry approaches in teaching and learning are consistent with these characteristics of human beings. When learnings are not relevant, they do not stir the curiosity of the learner; there is no challenge to him to discover something he does not know. Consequently, he experiences no need satisfaction in learning and becomes bored and disinterested in his social studies class.

7. Is the scope of the program realistic in terms of the contemporary world and the backgrounds of today's pupils?

No dimension of human experience has escaped feeling the effects of the incredibly rapid and profound changes that have characterized human affairs in modern times.[9] Social studies programs being planned for pupils of today must recognize that these pupils are living in predominantly urban environments in a time of communication satellites, supersonic air travel, and nuclear energy. The child of today and the adult of tomorrow is a highly mobile individual, and his movements will not be restricted in any significant degree either by physical barriers or by national boundaries. The modern social studies program, therefore, needs to be cosmopolitan in character and global in scope.

[8] Philip H. Phenix. *Realms of Meaning*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

[9] Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan, editors. *Prospective Changes in Society by 1980* and *Implications for Education of Prospective Changes in Society*. Conference Reports. Denver, Colorado: Designing Education for the Future, an Eight-State Project, July 1966. (Project Office: 1362 Lincoln Street, Denver 80203.)

One serious limitation of many elementary social studies programs is their continuing emphasis on what might be called a rural rather than an urban style of life. Rural styles of living are embraced because they tend to be more closely related to traditional value patterns. They represent in something of a mythical way a simple way of life uncluttered by the complexities of modern living. But the social studies curriculum must deal with realities, not myths; and one of the realities is that most children of today will spend their lives in urban environments. This means that they need to learn how to deal with the problems of urban living and be able to find their way around in a city.

What is being suggested here cannot be taken care of adequately by a unit somewhere in the grades entitled "Life in the Big City." What is needed is an approach and emphasis *throughout* the entire program that reflects urban styles of life—crowds, noise, confusion, traffic, pollution and sanitation problems, as well as the many opportunities for personal growth, cultural advantages, economic security, and so on. It should be noted in passing that the migration to the cities and the growth of massive urban centers are not unique to the United States but are a worldwide phenomenon.

Population growth, urbanization, and increased industrialization are placing great demands on the world's essential resources and are also contributing to serious problems of environmental contamination. Because solving these problems is fundamental to man's survival, one might expect that they would constitute an important part of the education of citizens. To date, however, few school programs have seriously addressed themselves to these issues.

Almost all elementary school social studies programs teach pupils how man has developed new farmlands through irrigation. Few teach anything at all about the vast amount of productive farmland lost each year through urban expansion, industrial development, and highway construction. Few programs acquaint pupils with problems relating to refuse disposal and air pollution, both of which are choking our cities, endangering plant life, and contaminating our water resources. Instruction dealing with the conservation of natural resources in schools today tends to follow the model of such instruction developed during the 1930s—soil conservation, erosion, reforestation. While these topics are still important, new and more critical problems dealing with man's use of his environment have developed. Unless more is done to educate citizens in ways of managing these problems, the consequences of their going unattended and unresolved are likely to be serious indeed. Experts differ on solutions to problems of environmental contamination and re-

source misuse, but all who study such problems agree that they are approaching critical proportions.[10]

With the increasing contact and interaction with other peoples of the world, Americans will need to develop a deeper understanding of and sensitivity to other cultures. Social studies programs have placed too great an emphasis on capes and bays, products and cities, rivers and mountains and an insufficient emphasis on cross-cultural studies that help pupils understand and appreciate the behavior of other people. Programs tend to have a things-places orientation rather than a people-values orientation. If we hold any hope for improved understanding of others, a substantial change in emphasis must be made in social studies programs.

The pupil of today has not, of course, been totally immune to the conditions of modern life that surround him. Taken as a group, children today are more knowledgeable about the world, have traveled more extensively, and are generally more sophisticated than their counterparts of a generation ago. Even in remote parts of the United States it is not uncommon to find pupils who have lived or traveled outside the country. Television has brought the entire world into the living rooms of American homes.

To build programs in social studies education without recognizing the enormous opportunities that children have to learn about the world outside of school represents poor planning, indeed. At the same time, not all children come to school with a rich and extensive experience with the world. Many have had extremely limited contacts with people, places, and things beyond the immediate area where they live. Local curriculum planning is the only way such variations in pupil backgrounds can be accommodated.

8. Are the learning activities and instructional resources consistent with the stated purposes of the program?

Purposes and objectives of social studies programs can be achieved only through the learning activities and instructional resources used by the pupil. This guideline underscores the need for consistency among activities, resources, and purposes. Purposes and objectives often are admirable and well-stated yet the learning activities and instructional resources being used seem to bear no relationship to such purposes and objectives. For example, if the development of thinking abilities of pupils

[10] *Ibid.*

is taken seriously as an objective of the social studies curriculum, activities and resources must be such as to place pupils in situations where alternatives can be considered and choices made. One does not develop thinking abilities of pupils by having them learn only the conclusions that have been made by others and summarized in textbooks. This should not be construed as a criticism of all textbooks. It is, rather, a reminder that these materials should be used in ways that are consonant with the major objectives of the program.

Consistency among the variables under discussion is more likely to be achieved if purposes, activities, and resources are tied closely together in curriculum documents. If purposes, activities, and resources appear at widely separated places, it becomes easy to perform activities and to use books, films, and other resources without knowing why. When social studies programs give the impression of being "play making and mural painting," it probably means that activities are being performed for their own sake without being properly related to objectives.

The guideline under discussion is one that is fairly easy to accept as a principle but one that is not always easy to implement. One reason for this is that certain activities and the use of certain resources is very time consuming. For example, a well-conducted depth study of one topic may take several weeks. The question of using time in this way is bound to be raised and can be answered adequately only in terms of whether or not the activities and resources needed to conduct a depth study are fundamental to the achievement of objectives set for the program.

9. Does the program provide adequately for differentiated instruction?

One of the most challenging tasks facing curriculum workers and teachers is that of providing programs of instruction that accommodate the variety of individual differences between and among pupils. No program in social studies can be rated well unless it comes to grips with this problem. Because classroom instruction is ordinarily conducted on a group rather than individual basis, the teacher must use methods of instruction that will be appropriate for individual pupils. This means that differentiated teaching strategies must be used in helping pupils attain objectives.

Providing for individual differences has always been an important requirement of good instruction in social studies, but it has received even more attention in recent years, due in part to a growing sensitivity of society to the special learning needs of disadvantaged children. However,

individual differences among pupils exist in every classroom, and every teacher is faced with the problem of differentiating instruction to meet the varying needs of pupils. Social studies instruction can be differentiated by making variations in objectives, in content, or in methodology.

In general, overall objectives of social studies education apply to all pupils regardless of ability or background. These objectives have to do primarily with the building of social and civic literacy. The specific objectives in attaining these overall goals, however, can and should be modified considerably for individual pupils. Objectives dealing with certain skills provide a good example. There is a cluster of work-study skills consisting of using references, abstracting and summarizing data, presenting oral and written reports to the class, and locating and using graphic devices such as charts and graphs. All these skills require well-developed verbal and linguistic abilities along with an inclination to scholarly approaches to learning. For many pupils they are appropriate, important, and necessary.

These skills are essential to pupils who fit the humanistic–liberal arts model of an educated person. But for many other pupils—and the number is unquestionably much larger than most teachers suspect—such skills are wholly inappropriate, and the attempt to learn them is a continuous and unnecessary exercise in frustration for pupils who lack verbal facility. For a great many youngsters, insisting that specific objectives of this type apply to all pupils makes successful achievement in social studies impossible. Specific objectives should be selected that are more in tune with the needs and aspirations of individual pupils.

Similarly, the subject matter of the program should be modified to suit backgrounds of pupils. There is a tendency in social studies curriculums to keep the content constant, with all pupils studying the same topics and subject matter. Some study the content slowly and simply; others more rapidly and at a more complex level. If pupils cannot read, the material is presented through non-reading vehicles such as recordings, pictures, films, and so forth. Perhaps classes for these pupils are made smaller in size to make the teaching task easier. It may be that special teacher assistants work with individual pupils. Yet basically the curriculum content remains the same for all. It is not likely that social studies so interpreted will hold much for slow-learning pupils until the policy of constancy in content is reexamined.

Variation in teaching strategies is still another dimension of differentiated instruction. The general practice seems to be to use basically the same methodologies with all pupils but to vary these in terms of intensity or complexity. This practice needs serious reconsideration as applied specifically to slow-learning pupils. What is needed are empirical approaches that make no assumptions as to the efficacy of well-established

methodologies used successfully in regular classrooms. Through such an experimental approach it is likely that fresh and vital teaching strategies will be discovered that are more effective than those in common use today.

Curriculum workers and teachers should not allow the attention now being focused on the slow-learning pupils and those from disadvantaged environments to obscure the need to individualize programs for pupils who are achieving at an average or superior rate. Social studies programs for these children can also be meaningless when instruction becomes uninspired and routine or when the program is insufficiently challenging. Teachers often assume that because these pupils *can* perform traditional reading-writing-reporting-type activities successfully, they enjoy and profit from them. As a result, social studies can become an exercise in boredom for bright pupils. The significant generalizations here are that differentiated instruction is essential at all levels of ability and that every pupil presents the teacher with the challenge of making the program meaningful to him as an individual human being.

10. Is the program one that teachers will understand and be able to implement and support?

Some districts have had the disappointing experience of developing a well-conceived and sound social studies curriculum only to find that it resulted in little actual change in classroom instruction. This can be avoided if properly anticipated and if teachers are involved at appropriate points along the way as the curriculum is being planned and developed. Teachers can hardly be expected to implement and support a program they do not understand or one to which they have no commitment, and it is reasonable to assume that any change is likely to cause teachers some anxiety. To some degree changes in established ways of doing things are nearly always threatening.

Curriculum documents should be relatively easy to understand and to follow. Overly complicated curriculum guides will simply not be used. This has become a problem in recent years as teachers are expected to synthesize concepts, generalizations, continuing themes, subject matter, skills, activities, learning resources, grade level emphases, and pupil expectancies into a functioning curriculum. The teacher is overwhelmed by the task of fitting all of the components together into a teachable program. In some cases, curriculum documents have become so complicated that only one well grounded in social studies education is able to understand them. Curriculum guides that do not clearly assist the teacher in his work are of little value.

The planning and implementation of curriculums in social studies must include attention to teacher involvement and in-service activities. To develop a curriculum and then to give it to the teacher to be implemented is usually an unsound procedure. The most successful programs have been those that have included teachers in the process of development. If a social studies curriculum revision is projected over a period of three or four years, most of the teachers in a district can be involved in the process in one way or another. This involvement can include serving on committees, trying out units, evaluating materials, attending workshops and institutes, and reacting to proposals.

11. Are the curriculum documents sufficiently structured to provide the teacher with direction, yet flexible enough to allow individual teacher initiative and creativity?

Curriculum documents that are too general are not especially useful to the classroom teacher. Hence, if the teacher finds that the curriculum guide does not define the program adequately for his purposes, he is likely to seek sources that have a more highly structured organization. An alternative commonly used is the textbook. One can hardly criticize the teacher for over-reliance on the textbook if he does not have any other organizing framework to guide him in his work.

Curriculum documents can also be *too* structured and inflexible. This happens when they provide a blueprint for doing everything, thereby allowing the teacher little opportunity to project himself into the program. The term "teacher proof" has been coined to describe programs that are so completely planned and specified that the teacher must implement them precisely as recommended. Not much creative teaching can take place if teachers are expected to use "teacher proof" materials. The implication that the teacher has nothing creative to contribute to the social studies program—that his role is akin to that of an automaton—is professionally degrading.

Curriculum documents should be highly *structured* in terms of purposes, objectives, concepts and skills to be included, methods of selecting content, and similar matters dealing with the definition of the intent and character of the program. They should be *flexible* in matters dealing with the actual teaching and working with pupils. These latter areas must be left to individual teachers even though suggestions can be made and are often welcomed by teachers. If a district is not satisfied with the way the teacher teaches, it must either change teaching practices through in-service education or engage teachers who can function in ways consistent with the district program.

12. Is it possible to evaluate the program in order to establish with some degree of confidence the extent to which major purposes have been achieved?

The effectiveness of programs can be evaluated only if the purposes and values sought have been carefully and specifically identified. Evaluation provides the means of improving programs because it should contribute feedback concerning the extent to which outcomes are consistent with stated purposes. When outcomes are not compatible with purposes, something is obviously wrong with the program. The objectives may not be suitable or attainable, or the instructional program—the input—may not be related to objectives, or the evaluative procedure may not be consonant with the objectives and the teaching methods.

Formal evaluation of the outcomes of social studies instruction usually consists of standardized examinations focusing on subject matter and skills learnings. There is probably a place for such evaluative procedures, especially if they are well conceived and if they measure other than simple recall behavior. However, if curriculums profess to teach a broad spectrum of cognitive, affective, and skills learnings, a wide range of evaluative techniques and devices will also need to be used to evaluate pupil performance.

Pupil achievement cannot always be taken as a reliable guide to the efficacy of a program, because in obtaining high levels of measurable achievement, teachers may have violated principles of good teaching and learning. For example, undue pressure may have been placed on pupils to learn the material needed to get high scores on the examinations. Also, if programs are evaluated only in terms of pupil achievement, there is a strong possibility that teachers will either consciously or inadvertently teach directly for the test. A preferred arrangement for evaluating programs is to use a set of guidelines of the type discussed in this paper and secure evidence of the presence or absence of each one.

Without some type of evaluation—formal, informal, systematic, or catch-as-catch-can—it is not possible to improve programs. The more systematic, objective, and broad-gauged the evaluation is, the more likely it will yield reliable and valid feedback for program improvement.

Curriculum Development

In applying the foregoing guidelines to the development of social studies curriculums at the school or district level, certain modifications should be made to fit the peculiarities of the local situation. No two districts face precisely the same problems nor do districts have identical school populations, levels of teacher preparation, or experience in either improving an existing curriculum or building a new one.

Curriculum development is only effective when it results in improved opportunities for pupils to learn. This usually means that teacher behavior needs to be changed, which in turn means that teachers' perceptions of what they are doing and what their roles are need to be changed. Without such a reorientation to the teaching task, curriculum revision becomes something of a façade and a ritual and does not result in long-lasting improvements in instruction.

The experience of countless school districts has reinforced time and again the idea that teacher involvement is an essential part of curriculum revision. The reason for this is that through the process of curriculum development the teacher is placed in a position of having to evaluate what he is doing and to think through new and better ways of helping pupils achieve soundly based learning goals. Such involvement also enhances a personal and professional commitment by the teacher to improve what he is doing. It is not likely that curriculum revision can be successful without such a commitment by teachers, for they are finally responsible for what does or does not happen in the classroom.

The process of curriculum improvement, therefore, can take many forms and can go in several directions. Even though this paper describes

one way of proceeding, it must be emphasized that this is only one way and there are other procedures that might be even more effective in specific settings. Just as in teaching, curriculum development begins at points that are in accord with the professional level of the teachers and staff. In a small, wealthy, suburban school district in which most teachers hold masters degrees and the principals and curriculum directors hold doctorates, approaches to curriculum revision will be different from those in a district in which a high level of professional preparation does not exist.

School districts that have a long history of traditional textbook teaching of social studies cannot and will not move overnight to an investigation-oriented approach, using a variety of pupil activities and instructional media. Such changes require much time and much teacher in-service growth and reeducation. Gross and wholesale curriculum changes rarely work successfully, but where they have worked, they have been accompanied by intensive in-service education. Ordinarily changes must be made slowly and one step at a time.

A central coordinating committee representing various grade levels will facilitate the process of building a curriculum or improving one already in operation. This committee should be chaired by someone who is knowledgeable in the social studies field, has leadership abilities, and has time to spend on curriculum work. It is the responsibility of the central coordinating committee to make plans for the project, assign specific tasks to subcommittees, involve appropriate persons, chart the course for the project, and steer it through to a successful completion. Such a committee must have dedicated and interested members who are given time aside from their teaching duties to devote to the project. The committee must meet regularly and no less than twice each month. Coordinating committees that meet once or twice a year, usually after school, are not able to be productive.

Curriculum development is both complex and time consuming. Moreover, it requires a degree of expertise over and beyond that needed for classroom teaching. Not all good classroom teachers function well on curriculum committees. The selection of teachers to serve on curriculum committees, therefore, needs to be made carefully. Teachers who are selected should have their teaching loads adjusted in accordance with the added responsibility to ensure that they will devote the time and energy to curriculum work that it deserves. Increasingly, school districts are employing teachers for curriculum work during a part of the summer. Districts that appreciate the value of teacher involvement in curriculum development will make these adjustments in a teacher's schedule and will be willing to underwrite the additional cost of such involvement.

To expect teachers to assume a major responsibility for curriculum development in addition to full-time teaching is unrealistic.

The central committee can begin its work in a variety of ways. It can make a study of the existing program to identify its strengths and its weaknesses. It can survey teacher opinion to discover crucial problems as perceived by teachers. It can make a study of what type of learning resources are available and are used. Or it can begin by informing itself of current developments in social studies education. The committee should establish and maintain contact with professional bodies, such as the National Council for the Social Studies, and should study their publications.

A sound principle in curriculum revision is that of early teacher involvement in exploring new approaches and procedures. Often curriculum development is needlessly delayed by extended theoretical discussions that produce no changes at the classroom level. Such delays try the patience of curriculum workers and teachers alike and should be avoided. Moreover, long delays usually mean that the composition of the curriculum committee has changed, new ideas have been uncovered, and, to some extent, the curriculum is out-of-date before it is even tried. A better procedure is to get ideas into operation at the classroom level, at least on a limited and trial basis, as soon as possible.

The committee needs to develop a rationale for social studies education that will be understood and accepted by the district. This statement, while it does not have to be long, must be specific enough to provide an orientation to the program and a framework within which other basic decisions are to be made. There is little point in proceeding with the development of a social studies curriculum until there is some general agreement concerning its basic point of view, its purposes, and its place in the total curriculum.

Another important task of the central coordinating committee is to draw up a list of specifications for the program. These specifications are based on the rationale of the program but are more precise in stating what the program is to do. They become the specific objectives for the program. The guidelines presented in this document can be useful in formulating such specifications.

In accordance with the specifications, the committee must now make decisions concerning emphases, concepts and generalizations, skills, values, and subject matter to be included. These should be charted in sequential patterns but are not yet tied to specific units of study. Having planned the project to this point, the committee can now make specific assignments to subcommittees. For example, a small grade-level subcommittee could be assigned the task of developing a unit or a portion of one. Directions to such subcommittees should be specific. Simply to

direct a teacher or a committee to construct a unit on a topic such as "Families Near and Far" is usually not advisable. It is better to indicate what emphasis is expected, i.e., what concepts or generalizations should serve as the central focus of the unit, and to provide a short narrative description of the treatment expected. The subcommittee or teacher could then be asked to identify main ideas to be developed in the unit and to construct the unit around these ideas.

As soon as first draft units are prepared, they can be tried and evaluated on a pilot basis. They should then be revised, tried, and evaluated again. This process continues until a satisfactory unit evolves. In the process, too, appropriate skills and affective learnings are built into the material, along with suggested activities and learning resources. An essential part of all such units is a list of suggested questions to stimulate reflective thinking.

An important responsibility of the central coordinating committee is to see that the program develops in accordance with the specifications. To assist in this task, the committee should have the services of consultants representing the social science disciplines and experts in social studies curriculum development. Indeed, such consultants should assist the committee in drawing up specifications for the program.

This process will involve a great many teachers. Such a practice has value in acquainting the staff members with what is being planned and also in soliciting from them the good ideas they have. In one large school district where this procedure was followed, approximately 80 percent of the teachers had at some time or other contributed to the development of the program. Needless to say, when the curriculum was finally officially adopted, the teachers were familiar with it and were enthusiastic about it.

In addition to teacher involvement, parents and other adults in the community need to play a contributing role in the preparation of social studies curriculums. As the program is being planned, it is wise to call on the council of representatives from various religious, social, business, labor, and other groups and to inform them about the program. Curriculum development is a technical and professional operation and should be done by those who have professional competence to do the job. At the same time, it should be recognized that social studies education touches the sensitivities of many, and to implement a program at all, potential sources of conflict should be anticipated and resolved before they develop into major areas of contention. Experience has repeatedly shown that no social studies curriculum can succeed without solid community support. Experience has also shown that when communities are informed about the intent, purpose, and procedures in a soundly based

program, they usually give wholehearted support. Misunderstandings and conflicts arise when parents and patrons are not kept informed.

As leaders in elementary education face the 1970s, they will find many challenges and satisfactions in building significant programs in social studies. Some of the direction-finders to high-quality programs are discussed in this paper. But the interesting paths and exciting trails that connect these guideposts are for teachers and pupils to discover for themselves. Of all the learnings in the curriculum, none will demand more of the teacher's skill than those embodied in the social studies. No apology need be made for this because the rich rewards of inspired and creative teaching of social studies to the individual and to society are unmatched by any of the other curriculum areas.

SELECTED REFERENCES

American Council of Learned Societies and the National Council for the Social Studies, cosponsors. *The Social Studies and The Social Sciences.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962.

Harry D. Berg, editor. *Evaluation in Social Studies.* Thirty-Fifth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1965.

Helen McCracken Carpenter, editor. *Skill Development in Social Studies.* Thirty-Third Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1963.

H. Millard Clements, William R. Fielder, and B. Robert Tabachnick. *Social Study: Inquiry in Elementary Classrooms.* New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1966.

C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas. *Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967.

Malcolm P. Douglas. *Social Studies: From Theory to Practice in Elementary Education.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1967.

Maxine Dunfee and Helen Sagl. *Social Studies Through Problem Solving: A Challenge to Elementary School Teachers.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.

Dorothy McClure Fraser and Samuel P. McCutcheon. *Social Studies in Transition: Guidelines to Change.* Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1965.

John Jarolimek, editor. *Social Studies Education: The Elementary School.* Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967.

John Jarolimek. *Social Studies in Elementary Education.* Third edition. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1967.

John Jarolimek and Huber M. Walsh, editors. *Readings for Social Studies in Elementary Education.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1965.

Bruce R. Joyce. *Strategies for Elementary Social Science Education.* Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1965.

John R. Lee and Jonathon C. McLendon, editors. *Readings on Elementary Social Studies: Prologue to Change.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Byron G. Massialas and Frederick R. Smith, editors. *New Challenges in the Social Studies.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1965.

John U. Michaelis. *Social Studies for Children in a Democracy.* Second edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Raymond H. Muessig, editor. *Social Studies Curriculum Improvement: A Guide for Local Committees.* Bulletin No. 36. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1965.

Raymond H. Muessig and Vincent R. Rogers, editors. *The Social Science Seminar Series* (Henry Steele Commager, *The Nature and the Study of History;* Jan O. M. Broek, *Geography: Its Scope and Spirit;* Pertti J. Pelto, *The Study of Anthropology;* Caroline B. Rose, *Sociology: The Study of Man in Society;* Francis J. Sorauf, *Political Science: An Informal Overview;* Richard S. Martin and Reuben G. Miller, *Economics and Its Significance*). Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.

Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon. *Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom.* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.

ASCD Publications

YEARBOOKS

Balance in the Curriculum Raises questions and issues affecting balance in instruction $4.00

Evaluation as Feedback and Guide Advocates replacing grades, marks, tests and credits with a simpler and more basic evaluation which is illustrated 6.50

Fostering Mental Health in Our Schools Relates mental health to the growth and development of children and youth in school 3.00

Guidance in the Curriculum Treats that part of guidance which can and should be done by teachers 3.75

Individualizing Instruction Seeks to identify and enhance human potential 4.00

Leadership for Improving Instruction Illustrates leadership role of persons responsible for improving instruction 3.75

Learning and Mental Health in the School Examines school's role in enhancing competence and self-actualization of pupils 5.00

Learning and the Teacher Analyzes classroom practices, seeking to derive ideas and concepts about learning 3.75

New Insights and the Curriculum Projects and examines new ideas in seven frontier areas 5.00

Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming: A New Focus for Education Applies new psychological insights in education 4.50

Research for Curriculum Improvement Helps teachers and others carry on successful research in school or classroom 4.00

Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director 4.50

What Shall the High Schools Teach? Raises questions related to content of the instructional program in secondary schools 3.75

PAMPHLETS

Assessing and Using Curriculum Content $1.00

Better Than Rating 1.25

Changing Curriculum Content 1.00

Children's Social Learning 1.75

Changing Curriculum: Mathematics, The 2.00

Changing Curriculum: Science, The 1.50

Collective Negotiation in Curriculum and Instruction 1.00

Curriculum Change: Direction and Process 2.00

Curriculum Materials 1967 2.00

Discipline for Today's Children and Youth 1.00

Elementary School Science: A Guide to Current Research 2.25

Elementary School We Need, The 1.25

Extending the School Year 1.25

Freeing Capacity To Learn 1.00

Guidelines for Elementary Social Studies 1.50

High School We Need, The .50

Human Variability and Learning 1.50

Humanities and the Curriculum, The 2.00

Humanizing Education: The Person in the Process 2.25

Improving Language Arts Instruction Through Research $2.75

Influences in Curriculum Change 2.25

Intellectual Development: Another Look 1.75

Junior High School We Need, The 1.00

Junior High School We Saw, The 1.50

Juvenile Delinquency 1.00

Language and Meaning 2.75

Learning More About Learning 1.00

Linguistics and the Classroom Teacher 2.75

New Curriculum Developments 1.75

New Dimensions in Learning 1.50

Nurturing Individual Potential 1.50

Personalized Supervision 1.75

Strategy for Curriculum Change 1.25

Supervision in Action 1.25

Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions 2.00

Supervisor: Agent for Change in Teaching, The 3.25

Theories of Instruction 2.00

Toward Professional Maturity 1.50

What Are the Sources of the Curriculum? 1.50

What Does Research Say About Arithmetic? 1.00

Child Growth Chart .25

Discounts on quantity orders of same title to single address: 2-9 copies, 10%; 10 or more copies, 20%. Orders for $2 or less must be accompanied by remittance. Postage and handling will be charged on all orders not accompanied by payment.

Subscription to EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP—$5.50 a year. ASCD Membership dues: Regular (Subscription and Yearbook)—$10.00 a year; Comprehensive (includes the above plus other publications issued during period of the membership)—$15.00 a year.

Order from:

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036